

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the application in light of the Office Action dated April 23, 2003. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 2-4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14-20, and 24-30 were pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all pending claims.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 3, 14, 16, 24-25, and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 5,842,176 issued to Hunt *et al.* ("Hunt") in view of Official Notice. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's Official Notice as to Claim 24. In any event, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Hunt* with the Official Notice fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every limitation of Applicants' claims.

Although Applicants believe Claim 24 is patentably distinct from *Hunt*, Applicants amend Claim 24 to further prosecution. Amended Claim 24 recites, in part, "receiving from a service provider a first reservation record relating to a first type of record, the first reservation record comprising travel attributes and a first version number, the travel attributes arranged in a first record format" and "receiving from the service provider a second reservation record relating to the first type of record, the second reservation record comprising at least a portion of the travel attributes associated with the first reservation record and a second version number different from the first version number, the travel attributes arranged in a second record format different from the first record format." Applicants respectfully submit that *Hunt*, combined with Official Notice, fails to teach, suggest, or disclose at least these aspects of amended independent Claim 24.

In short, *Hunt* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose a server receiving multiple reservation records, each in a different format, from a single service provider. The Examiner asserts that *Hunt* teaches that a server receives "passthrough" datasets from multiple computer reservation systems (CRSs), with each CRS implementing a different standard code language. (*See* Office Action, pp. 3-4).¹ The Examiner then claims that the server in *Hunt*

¹ Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's characterization of a CRS in *Hunt* as a "service provider" recited in Claim 24. For argument purposes only, Applicants will assume this for the remainder of the response.

communicates these datasets to a client² without normalizing or reformatting. But *Hunt* teaches that each CRS communicates using a single code language. (*See Hunt*, 1:41-43; *id.*, 3:63-66; *id.*, 4:3-4). Accordingly – even if the Examiner’s interpretation of *Hunt* is correct – *Hunt* necessarily fails to teach, suggest, or disclose “receiving from a service provider a first reservation record relating to a first type of record, the first reservation record comprising travel attributes and a first version number, the travel attributes arranged in a first record format” and “receiving from the service provider a second reservation record relating to the first type of record, the second reservation record comprising at least a portion of the travel attributes associated with the first reservation record and a second version number different from the first version number, the travel attributes arranged in a second record format different from the first record format” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 24.

Moreover, Applicants traverse the Examiner’s position that “different code languages” is equivalent to “the travel attributes arranged in a second record format different from the first record format” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 24. (*See Office Action*, p. 4). *Hunt* teaches that the code languages are merely “series of cryptic, hard to understand codes. These codes normally comprise a series of ASCII characters.” (*Hunt*, 1:29-31). There is no teaching, suggestion, or disclosure in *Hunt* that two travel agent requests including different codes are “arranged in a second record format different from the first record format.” Indeed, *Hunt* discloses that the codes are easily interchangeable. (*See id.*, 1:43-49 stating “a travel agent can easily become confused when interacting with one of the computer reservation systems because of the variation in code words. A travel agent may erroneously enter a code for one computer reservation system while attempting to interact with a second reservation system.”). For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 24.

Claims 3 and 25 depend from Claim 24 shown above to be allowable. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 3 and 25. For at least the reasons stated above with regard to amended Claim 24, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of amended independent Claim 29. Claims 14, 16, and 30 depend from Claim 29, shown above to be allowable. For at least

² Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s characterization of the client in *Hunt* as the “data store” recited in Claim 24. For argument purposes only, Applicants will assume this for the remainder of the response.

these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 14, 16, and 30.

The Examiner rejects Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hunt* in view of Official Notice, as applied to claim 24, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,331,546 issued to Webber *et al.* ("Webber") and U.S. Patent No. 6,212,512 issued to Barney *et al.* ("Barney") and rejects Claims 2, 4, 15, and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hunt* and Official Notice as applied to claims 24 and 29, and in further view of *Barney*. For at least the reasons stated above with regard to Claim 24, *Hunt* – even in view of Official Notice, *Barney*, and *Webber* – fails to teach, suggest, or disclose various aspects of Claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17-19, and 26-28. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17-19, and 26-28.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all Claims.

Although no fees are believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-0765 of Electronic Data Systems Corporation.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of this application, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call its attorney at the number listed below.

RECEIVED
JUL 29 2003
GROUP 3600

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Samir A. Bhavsar
Reg. No. 41,617

Date: July 22, 2003

Correspondence Address:

Baker Botts, L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
Phone: 214.953.6581
Fax: 214.661.4581

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 35005